

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have been amended, and new claims 11 and 12 added to improve the clarity of the claimed subject matter and to bring the claims into conformity with U.S. practice and format, and to place the application fully in condition for allowance. All of the amendments are supported by the originally disclosure of this application. The original Abstract has been amended to provide a more concise summary of the disclosure in accordance with U.S. practice format.

The specification has been amended in order to improve syntax. No new matter has been entered. Entry of the amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 remain pending upon entry of the amendments to the claims above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 7 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claims 7 and 9 have been rewritten as new claims 11 and 12. Please note that claims 7 and 9 recite that "the light beam is reflected by said light valve to said projection lens," instead of "total reflects by said light valve to said projection lens," solely to improve syntax. The new claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, the Examiner indicating that claim 10 is inconsistent with claim 8, the Examiner indicating that the auxiliary prism in claim 10 is not between the "total internal reflection prism" and the light source. It appears that the Examiner is referring to the "total

internal reflection surface" instead of the "total internal reflection prism". Claim 10 has been amended to more positively claim the inventive subject matter. In view of the amendments to claim 10, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. The auxiliary prism is located between the total internal reflection surface and the light source, as illustrated in Figures 6-8.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by U.S. 6,461,000 (Magarill). The claims have been amended to more clearly claim the inventive subject matter. If the earlier rejection is to be maintained, Applicant most respectfully traverses such finding.

Applicant respectfully wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2131 which states that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed.Cir. 1990).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to positively recite a "beveled" total internal reflection surface and that the light source is arranged adjacent to the beveled total internal reflection surface. Support for this amendment is found in at least page 3, lines 12-18 of the original specification. Applicant respectfully submits that this

Application No.: 10/652,023
Amendment dated: November 15, 2004
Reply to Office Action of: June 15, 2004

claimed feature is not taught in the reference to Magarill. In addition, the device of Magarill is similar to the arrangement of the prior art device illustrated and described in the application (Figs. 1 and 2, Pages 1 and 2), and therefore includes the deficiencies thereof as stated in the "Description of the Related Art" portion of the disclosure.

In view of the amendments to the claims, and the remarks above, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 2-6 and 8 depend from claim 1, and are believed to overcome the cited reference as well.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art individually or collectively shows the invention as claimed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims appears to be warranted and the same is respectfully requested. In the event there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application which can be resolved by a telephone call or facsimile communication to Applicant's Attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile at the numbers provided below.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



WONKI K. PARK
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,991

Date: November 15, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: 703-683-0500
Facsimile: 703-683-1080

WP/jrs

S:\Producer\wp\LIAO 652023\amendment.wpd